REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 11, 17, 20, and 21 are currently pending. Claims 13-15 were previously canceled and claims 2, 4, 7-10, 12, 18, and 19 are canceled herewith. Claim 16 was previously withdrawn. Claims 1, 3, 5, 11, and 17 have been amended. Claims 2 and 4 have been incorporated into claim 1; claim 12 has been incorporated into claim 11; and claims 18 and 19 have been incorporated into claim 17. No new matter is added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 11, and 17 are rejected under Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner argues that the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner contends that the recitation of transmitting to the first terminal "only" a detecting script and transmitting "only" the updating information is not supported by the original application. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection and solely to advance prosecution, claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended to address the rejection by deleting the word "only." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 11, and 17 are rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. In particular, the Examiner argues that the recitation of transmitting to the first terminal "only" a detecting script and transmitting "only" the updating information is unclear. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection and solely to advance prosecution, claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended to address the rejection by deleting the word "only." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1 and 7 are also rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. The Examiner argues that

it is unclear whether the update information received by the terminal which results in an update to a web page is the same update information transmitted from the terminal which indicates the updates to the web page which had already been made. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection and solely to advance prosecution, claim 7 has been canceled and claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the terminal is provided with means to cause the updating script to update the web page based on said update information "generated by another terminal" which was received from said server. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 11 is also rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. The Examiner argues that it is unclear what the recited "part update information" are intended to refer back to. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection and solely to advance prosecution, claim 11 has been amended to recite "said" part update information in the third, fourth, and fifth elements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 11 and 17 are rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. The Examiner argues that it is unclear whether the server inserts the detecting script and updating script into the web page on the terminals. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection and solely to advance prosecution, claims 11 and 17 have been amended to delete this language. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,950,852 (Kobayaghi et al.) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0016873 (Ohkado et al.) further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,691,176 (Narin et al.). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious over Ohkado et al. in view of Kobayaghi et al. further in view of Narin et al. Claim 19 is rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious over Kobayaghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. further in view of Narin et al. and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105819 (Kim et al.). The rejections of claims 2, 4, 7-10, 12, 18, and

19 are rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining claims are patentable in light of the amendments and arguments presented herein and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

The cited combinations of references do not render the claims obvious because the references fail to teach all of the elements of the claims. On page 11 of the Office action of 08/12/2010, the Examiner argues that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 1 (previously part of claim 4) which recites "a storing means to store identification information, which identifies said terminals individually, in association with the update information and part update information sent from the individual terminals corresponding to the identification information." Further, on page 27 of the Office action, the Examiner argues that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 11 which recites "a storing means to store identification information which identifies said prescribed terminal, in association with said update information and said part update information." Finally, on page 31 of the Office action, the Examiner argues that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 17 (previously part of claim 19) which recites "said server storing the identification information of said first terminal in association with said received update information and part update information." However, in each case Ohkado et al. only refers to the use of User Access Identifiers (UAIs) to identify agents and customers but does not reference storing identification information "in association with" the update information and part update information sent from the individual terminals corresponding to the identification information as recited in claims 1, 11, and 17.

Similarly, the Examiner argues on pages 11-12 of the Office action that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 1 (previously part of claim 4) which recites "a means to, when a prescribed terminal logs in using said identification information, retrieve from said storing means the update information and part update information associated with the same identification information as said login identification information." Further, on pages 27-28 of the Office action the Examiner argues that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 11 which recites "a means to, when another terminal logs in using the identification information of said prescribed terminal, retrieve from said storing means the update information and said part update information associated with the identification information that is the same as said identification information used for the login." Finally, on page 31 of the Office action, the Examiner argues

that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 17 (previously part of claim 19) which recites "said server retrieving the update information and part update information <u>associated with the same identification information as the said login identification information</u>." Again, however, Ohkado et al. fails to teach the elements of the claims including retrieving update information and part update information "associated with" the same identification information as the login identification information, as recited in claims 1, 11, and 17.

Similarly, the Examiner argues on page 12 of the Office action that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 1 (previously part of claim 4) which recites "a means to first transmit said retrieved update information and then transmit said retrieved part update information to said prescribed terminal." Finally, on page 31 of the Office action, the Examiner argues that Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 17 (previously part of claim 19) which recites "said server first transmitting said retrieved update information and then transmitting said retrieved part update information." Again, however, Ohkado et al. fails to teach the elements of the claims including first transmitting the retrieved update information and then transmitting the retrieved part update information, as recited in claims 1 and 17. The Examiner does not indicate whether or how Ohkado et al. teaches the element of claim 11 which recites "a means to first transmit said update information and then transmit said part update information to said another terminal."

The remaining claims are allowable at least because each depends from an allowable independent claim and because each contains additional patentable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented herein, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. The Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned at the phone number below should any issues remain with respect to the application.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP

/thomas j. keating/

By: _____

Thomas J. Keating, Reg. No. 59,110
Tel.: 608-257-3501

Dated: November 12, 2010

Docket: 202064-9001 US00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
Two Prudential Plaza
180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Tel.: 312.222.0800
Fax: 312.222.0818